

REMARKS

Claims 11, and 24 through 27 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 through 10, 12 through 16, 20, 22, and 28 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 12 are amended.

Claim 1 through 10 and 12 through 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by US 6,721,784 (Leonard). Claims 20, 22, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,721,784 (Leonard) in view of US 7,209,953 (Brooks).

Independent claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, wherein said transceiver is further configured to receive, from a server, an audit identifier and embed said audit identifier into a message attachment prior to transmission of said message. Independent claim 20 provides, *inter alia*, wherein the audit identifier is embedded into a message attachment. Independent claim 28 provides, *inter alia*, embedding said audit identifier into said message attachment. Thus, the audit identifier is embedded into a message attachment.

In contrast, Leonard and Brooks, individually or in combination, do not describe or suggest an audit identifier embedded into a message attachment, as required by claims 1, 20, and 28. Section 3.2 (page 3) of the above Office Action references col. 2, lines 31 through 34, of Brooks in rejecting this language above. However, Brooks discloses an email having an attachment identifier attached "thereto", i.e., the attachment identifier is attached to the email. The device, server and method of claims 1, 20, and 28 provide an audit identifier embedded into a message attachment, whereas an attachment identifier of Brooks attaches to the message itself. Therefore, claims 1, 20, and 28 distinguish from Leonard, Brooks, and the suggested combination of these references.

Dependent claims 2 through 10 and 12 through 16 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Dependent claim 22 depends from, and includes all limitations of, independent claim 20. Therefore, claims 2 through 10, 12 through 16, and 22 distinguish from Leonard, Brooks, and the suggested combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claims 1 and 20.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 10, 12 through 16, 20, 22, and 28 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048
Customer Number: 20280

By: /HISASHI D. WATANABE/ 08/13/2009

Hisashi D. Watanabe
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 37,465

Telephone: 847-523-2322